

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 9, 2007. Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 21 and 23 to 39 are pending in the present application. Claims 6 and 22 are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 33 to 39 are newly-added, and Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 to 13, 17, 19, 21 and 23 to 29 are amended herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Drawing Objections

The drawings are objected to for allegedly being inconsistent with the specification. More particularly, the Office Action alleges that the description at paragraph [0033] of the specification is inconsistent with Figure 1.

The specification has been amended at paragraph [0033] to attend to the above objection. No new matter is believed to have been added to the application with this amendment. Accordingly, corrected drawing sheets are not believed to be necessary, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings are respectfully requested.

Specification Objections

The abstract is objected for allegedly using form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims. The amendments to the abstract are seen to attend to this objection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

The specification is also objected to for various other alleged informalities. The amendments to the specification are seen to attend to this objection. No new matter is believed to have been added to the application with these amendments. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 6 to 11 and 22 to 26 are objected to for allegedly being unclear in view of the specification. In particular, it is alleged that these claims recite “successfully demodulated” while paragraphs [0069] to [0080] of the specification describe “successfully decoding.” The amendments to paragraph [0069] of the specification are seen to attend to this objection. No new matter is believed to have been added to the application with these amendments. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

The claims are also objected to for various other alleged informalities. The amendments to the claims are seen to attend to this objection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 7, 12, 13, 23, 25, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, for alleged indefiniteness.

The amendments to Claims 12, 13, 28 and 29 are seen to attend to the rejection of these claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection with respect to Claims 12, 13, 28 and 29 are respectfully requested.

However, the rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to Claims 7, 23 and 25.

Regarding Claims 7 and 23, the Office Action alleges that “it is unclear what is meant by demodulating the portion of the second data signal when the portion is received.” Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, these claims recite demodulating a portion of the second data signal that is received after the first data signal is successfully demodulated, and that the demodulating occurs when the portion is received. Accordingly, Claims 7 and 23 are seen to be clear.

Regarding Claim 25, the Office Action alleges it is unclear what is done in parallel. Applicants respectfully submit that the processing subsystem of Claim 25 is configured to demodulate “the stored portion of the second data signal” and “the portion of the second data signal received after the first data signal is successfully demodulated” in parallel. Accordingly, Claim 25 is seen to be clear.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 and 103

Claims 1 to 3, 14 to 19 and 30 to 32 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,414,988 (Ling); Claims 4 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over Ling in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,544,156 (Teder); and Claims 5 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over Ling in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0021683 (Holtzman).

While not necessarily acquiescing to the aforementioned art rejections set forth by the Examiner and in the interest of advancing the prosecution of the application, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 17 with the allowable subject matter of respective dependent claims 6 and 22 that were indicated as allowable by the Examiner. Applicants have further

Application No. 10/781,461
Amendment dated February 11, 2008
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

amended dependent claims 11 and 17, objected to as including allowable subject matter, into independent form. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the aforementioned art rejections are now deemed moot in view of these amendments.

Applicants further submit new claims 33-39 for consideration by the Examiner.

Application No. 10/781,461
Amendment dated February 11, 2008
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Applicants request a three month extension of time to file this Amendment to the Office Action issued August 9, 2007. Please charge the extension fee to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated February 11, 2008

By: /George J. Oehling/

:

George Oehling, Reg. No. 40,471
858.658.1761

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502
ORC 429783-1.079916.0299